

## REMARKS

By the foregoing Amendment, Claims 21, 24, 26, 27, 28 have been amended, Claims 25 and 41 have been cancelled, and new Claim 42 has been added. Claims 1-20 were previously cancelled. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The Examiner indicated that that information disclosure statements filed July 1 and July 29, 2005 were defective in that copies of the prior art references were not submitted. Applicant proposes to submit copies of the prior art references listed in a separate submission, for the Examiner's consideration.

Claims 21-24 and 33-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) on the grounds of anticipation by LaMarca, disclosing a solenoid for actuating valves, in which an outer encapsulation 12 formed of a material with a higher melting point is fused to a bobbin 42 formed of a material having a lower melting point. Claim 21 has been amended to recite "wherein the basic body includes at least one protruding rib and at least one undercut formed adjacent to said at least one protruding rib," and "said second hard thermoplastic synthetic material engaging said at least one protruding rib and said at least one undercut." Support for the amendment can be found in the specification at page 3, paragraph 16, and page 5, paragraph 19, as well as former Claim 25, which has been cancelled. It is respectfully submitted that LaMarca does not teach, disclose or suggest a basic body including at least one protruding rib and at least one undercut formed adjacent to the at least one protruding rib, and an encapsulating second hard thermoplastic

synthetic material engaging the at least one protruding rib and the at least one undercut as is claimed. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 21-24 and 33-34 are novel and inventive over LaMarca, and that the rejection of Claims 21-24 and 33-34 on the grounds of anticipation by LaMarca should be withdrawn.

Claims 25-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) on the grounds of obviousness from LaMarca in view of Shimada et al., which was cited as disclosing a basic body having a protruding rib 2B' and an under cut 2C formed near a connection head 9. Claim 25 has been cancelled. The feature of "at least one protruding rib and at least one undercut" from Claim 25 has been introduced into Claim 21. At page 11, paragraph 150, Shimada et al. describes the element 2B' as an upper flange, and the element 2C as a notch. The Examiner referred to Figs. 22-24, and in Fig. 24, Shimada et al. clearly shows that the element 2C is a notch in the upper flange 2B', not an undercut formed adjacent to a rib, as is claimed. It is respectfully submitted that Shimada et al. also does not teach, disclose or suggest a basic body including at least one protruding rib and at least one undercut formed adjacent to the at least one protruding rib, and an encapsulating second hard thermoplastic synthetic material engaging the at least one protruding rib and the at least one undercut as is claimed.

Claim 24 further recites a protruding rib adjacent to the limitation collar and an undercut between the limitation collar and the protruding rib, the second hard thermoplastic synthetic material of the encapsulation engaging the limitation collar, the protruding rib adjacent to the limitation collar and the undercut between the limitation collar and the protruding rib adjacent to the limitation collar. Claim 26, which now

depends from Claim 24, further recites a protruding rib adjacent to the connection head and an undercut between the connection head and the protruding rib, the second hard thermoplastic synthetic material of the encapsulation engaging the connection head, the protruding rib adjacent to the connection head and the undercut between the connection head and the protruding rib adjacent to the connection head. Claim 27 further recites the second hard thermoplastic synthetic material of the encapsulation engaging the at least one relief, and Claim 28 further recites the second hard thermoplastic synthetic material of the encapsulation engaging the at least one passage. Claim 29 depends from Claim 28. It is respectfully submitted that LaMarca and Shimada et al. do not teach, disclose or suggest a protruding rib adjacent to the limitation collar and an undercut between the limitation collar and the protruding rib, the second hard thermoplastic synthetic material of the encapsulation engaging the limitation collar, the protruding rib adjacent to the limitation collar and the undercut between the limitation collar and the protruding rib adjacent to the limitation collar; a protruding rib adjacent to the connection head and an undercut between the connection head and the protruding rib, the second hard thermoplastic synthetic material of the encapsulation engaging the connection head, the protruding rib adjacent to the connection head and the undercut between the connection head and the protruding rib adjacent to the connection head; the second hard thermoplastic synthetic material of the encapsulation engaging the at least one relief; or the second hard thermoplastic synthetic material of the encapsulation engaging the at least one passage. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 25-29 are novel and inventive over LaMarca and Shimada et al., either taken individually or in combination,

and that the rejection of Claims 25-29 on the grounds of obviousness from LaMarca in view of Shimada et al. should be withdrawn.

Claims 30-32 and 35-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) on the grounds of obviousness from LaMarca in view of Widiger et al., which was cited as disclosing a main winding and an auxiliary winding, and connection pins in a socket. The Examiner also applied LaMarca in view of Widiger et al. against Claim 40, so that the rejection is understood to apply to Claims 30-32 and 35-40.

Claim 35 depends from Claim 21, and Claim 36 depends from Claim 21. The Examiner did not apply any references against Claims 35 and 36. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 35 and 36 are novel and inventive over the references cited, and that the rejection of Claims 35 and 36 should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, Claims 30-32 and 35-40 depend from Claim 21, which recites "wherein the basic body includes at least one protruding rib and at least one undercut formed adjacent to said at least one protruding rib," and "said second hard thermoplastic synthetic material engaging said at least one protruding rib and said at least one undercut." It is respectfully submitted that Widiger et al. also does not teach, disclose or suggest a basic body including at least one protruding rib and at least one undercut formed adjacent to the at least one protruding rib, and an encapsulating second hard thermoplastic synthetic material engaging the at least one protruding rib and the at least one undercut as is claimed. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 30-32 and 35-40 are novel and inventive over LaMarca and Widiger et al., either taken individually

or in combination, and that the rejection of Claims 30-32 and 35-40 on the grounds of obviousness from LaMarca in view of Widiger et al. should be withdrawn.

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance, and an early favorable action in this regard is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FULWIDER PATTON LLP

By: 

James W. Paul  
Reg. No. 29,967

JWP/rvw  
Encls.: Return Postcard

Howard Hughes Center  
6060 Center Drive, Tenth Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90045  
Telephone: (310) 824-5555  
Facsimile: (310) 824-9696  
Customer No. 24201

125972.1